



STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

MICHAEL F. EASLEY  
GOVERNOR

LYNDO TIPPETT  
SECRETARY

August 23, 2005

MEMORANDUM TO: Meeting Participants

FROM: Edwin A. Peters  
Project Development Engineer

SUBJECT: Meeting Minutes for U-2525 B & C, Greensboro Eastern  
and Northern Urban Loop, I-85 Bypass east of Greensboro  
to Lawndale Drive, North of Greensboro in Guilford  
County, North Carolina

On Monday, August 22, 2005 a meeting was held in the Project Development & Environmental Analysis Conference Room # 470 for the subject project. The attendees of the meeting were as follows:

Edwin Peters	PDEA
Drew Joyner	PDEA
Eric Midkiff	PDEA
John Thomas	USACE
John Hennessy	DWQ
Sue Homewood	DWQ
Danny Gardner	NCDOT
James Speer	NCDOT
Paul Fisher	NCDOT
Jackie Armstrong	NCDOT
Brett Feulner	NCDOT
Sarah McBride	DCR / SHPO
Guy Winebrenner	Mactec
John Gauthier	NCDOT

The objective of the meeting was to have a "meeting of the minds" to develop a clear schedule for the remainder of the project and a feasible course of action for the merger process. A goal of introducing any issues that may affect the critical path for completion of the environmental document was also achieved.

Major topics of discussion are shown below.

- Kristina Soldberg opened the meeting introductions of attendees with and followed with the purpose of the project, description of alternatives and current project schedule. In Kristina's discussion, she pointed out segment A, which has already been constructed. Kristina emphasized that the building of segment A limits the possibility of using previously analyzed crossovers and other alternatives, therefore the LEDPA by elimination has become the middle alternative.
- John Thomas representing the Corps of Engineers stated that conversations with the previous corps representative (Eric Alsmeyer) have confirmed that the corps concurred on the "middle" alternative. Based on the corps concurrence and the completion of the initial segment of the project to US 70, John recommended the project enter the merger process at concurrence point 2A/4A.
- Sarah McBride of the SHPO stated that the concurrence for the historic architecture is outdated and may need to be re-evaluated.
- John Hennessy of the DWQ recommended consulting the merger team before bypassing concurrence point 3 (LEDPA). John's sentiment was moving the project without the other merger team member's input may cause problems later in the permitting stage.
- Sarah McBride stated the SHPO cannot sign off on LEDPA because of the uncertainty of what is in place in the field. If the project is beyond the LEDPA stage, SHPO would prefer to have the merger meeting without seeking to sign a concurrence form for LEDPA.
- Sue Homewood of the DWQ suggested that NCDOT present the history of the project and how we arrived at the current point in which LEDPA has been established while seeking signatures for concurrence points 2A and 4A only.
- James Bridges of PDEA/NCDOT stated that because permits were issued for the portion of the project that has been built, proper coordination has taken place with the resource agencies. The endorsement of the already completed portion is somewhat of an endorsement for the remainder of the project because there are no alternatives that coincide with the completion of the project except the middle alternative.

- John Thomas (USACE) stated that because it is a pipeline project and the current status is limiting, we are in a position to move into avoidance and minimization within the 100 foot corridor. All questions need to be answered at the next meeting and nothing should go undone to resurface at the permitting stage of the process.
- John Hennessy stated that from the DWQ standpoint, that this would be Sue Homewood's decision because it is her project. John said he would have no problem supporting Sue's decision.

To wrap up the meeting, it was determined that the project should enter the merger process at a 2A/4A concurrence meeting. The concurrence meeting will include a history of how the project has arrived to its current position with an established LEDPA and a detailed plan of action for the remaining project schedule. The date for the concurrence meeting is anticipated to be in November 2005.